

MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION

Planning and Building Department
Community and Environmental Planning Division
333 W. Ocean Boulevard, 5th Floor
Long Beach, CA 90802

In accordance with the California Environmental Quality Act, the Long Beach City Planning Commission has conducted an Initial Study to determine whether the following project may have a significant adverse effect on the environment. On the basis of that study, the Planning Commission hereby finds that the proposed project will not have a significant adverse effect on the environment and does not require the preparation of an Environmental Impact Report because either the proposed project:

- a. has or creates no significant environmental impacts requiring mitigation; or
- b. will not create a significant adverse effect, because the Mitigation Measures described in the initial study have been added to the project.

The environmental documents that constitute the Initial Study and provide the basis and reasons for this determination are attached and hereby made a part of this document.

PROJECT:

Title: Martin Luther King Jr. Park Pool Addition

Location: 1105 East 19th Street

Description: Addition of new locker rooms; a classroom, office, and lobby to the existing enclosed community swimming pool.

Project Proponent or Applicant: Anna Mendiola, Long Beach Parks, Recreation and Marine, 2760 Studebaker Road, Long Beach, CA 90815

Hearing Date: May 6, 2004 Hearing Time: 1:30 p.m.

Location: City Hall Council Chambers, 333 W. Ocean Boulevard, Long Beach

Project Contact Person: Lynette Ferenczy Telephone: (562) 570-6273

CEQA Contact Person: Jerome C. Olivera Telephone: (562) 570-5081

NOTICE:

If you wish to appeal the appropriateness or adequacy of this document, address your written comments to our finding that the project will not have a significant adverse effect on the environment: (1) identify the environmental effect(s), why they would occur, and why they would be significant, and (2) suggest any mitigation measures which you believe would eliminate or reduce the effect to an acceptable level. Regarding item (1) above, explain the basis for your comments and submit any supporting data or references.

Date: April 5, 2004

NOTE: This document and supporting attachments are provided for review by the general public. This is an information document about environmental effects only. Supplemental information is on file and may be reviewed in the office listed above. The decision making body will review this document and potentially many other sources of information before considering the proposed project.

ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST FORM

1. Project title:

Martin Luther King Jr. Park Pool Addition

2. Lead agency name and address:

City of Long Beach Planning Commission
333 West Ocean Boulevard, Fourth Floor
Long Beach, CA 90802

3. CEQA contact person and phone number:

Jerome C. Olivera, Community Planner
Community and Environmental Planning Division
(562) 570-5081

4. Project location:

Martin Luther King Jr. Park
1105 E. 19th Street
Long Beach, CA 90806

5. Project sponsor's name and address:

Long Beach Parks, Recreation and Marine

6. General plan designation:

LUD – 11: Open Space/Parks

7. Zoning:

P - Park

8. Description of project:

Addition of locker rooms; a classroom, office, and lobby to the existing enclosed community swimming pool.

9. Surrounding land uses and setting:

The project site is currently developed as a community park. The surrounding neighborhood is predominately residential, with Long Beach City College located to the east.

10. Other public agencies whose approval is required: (e.g., permits, financing approval, or participation agreement.)

Long Beach Parks and Recreation Commission
Long Beach City Council on Appeal

ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS POTENTIALLY AFFECTED:

The environmental factors checked below would be potentially affected by this project, involving at least one impact that is a "Potentially Significant Impact" as indicated by the checklist on the following pages.

| | | |
|--|------------------------------------|---------------------------------|
| Aesthetics | Agriculture Resources | Air Quality |
| Biological Resources | Cultural Resources | Geology /Soils |
| X Hazards & Hazardous Materials | Hydrology / Water Quality | X Land Use / Planning |
| Mineral Resources | Noise | Population / Housing |
| Public Services | Recreation | X Transportation/Traffic |
| Utilities / Service Systems | Mandatory Findings of Significance | |

DETERMINATION: (To be completed by the Lead Agency)

On the basis of this initial evaluation:

I find that the proposed project COULD NOT have a significant effect on the environment, and a NEGATIVE DECLARATION will be prepared.

I find that although the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, there will not be a significant effect in this case because revisions in the project have been made by or agreed to by the project proponent. A MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION will be prepared.

X

I find that the proposed project MAY have a significant effect on the environment, and an ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT is required.

I find that the proposed project MAY have a "potentially significant impact" or "potentially significant unless mitigated" impact on the environment, but at least one effect 1) has been adequately analyzed in an earlier document pursuant to applicable legal standards, and 2) has been addressed by mitigation measures based on the earlier analysis as described on attached sheets. An ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT is required, but it must analyze only the effects that remain to be addressed.

I find that although the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, because all potentially significant effects (a) have been analyzed adequately in an earlier EIR pursuant to applicable standards, and (b) have been avoided or mitigated pursuant to that earlier EIR, including revisions or mitigation measures that are imposed upon the proposed project, nothing further is required.

Signature

Date

Jerome C. Olivera
Printed Name

EVALUATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS:

- 1) A brief explanation is required for all answers except "No Impact" answers that are adequately supported by the information sources a lead agency cites in the parentheses following each question. A "No Impact" answer is adequately supported if the referenced information sources show that the impact simply does not apply to projects like the one involved (e.g., the project falls outside a fault rupture zone). A "No Impact" answer should be explained where it is based on project-specific factors as well as general standards (e.g., the project will not expose sensitive receptors to pollutants, based on a project-specific screening analysis).
- 2) All answers must take account of the whole action involved, including off-site as well as on-site, cumulative as well as project-level, indirect as well as direct, and construction as well as operational impacts.
- 3) Once the lead agency has determined that a particular physical impact may occur, then the checklist answers must indicate whether the impact is potentially significant, less than significant with mitigation, or less than significant. "Potentially Significant Impact" is appropriate if there is substantial evidence that an effect may be significant. If there are one or more "Potentially Significant Impact" entries when the determination is made, an EIR is required.
- 4) "Negative Declaration: Less than Significant with "Mitigation Incorporated" applies where the incorporation of mitigation measures has reduced an effect from "Potentially Significant Impact" to a "Less Than Significant Impact." The lead agency must describe the mitigation measures, and briefly explain how they reduce the effect to a less than significant level (mitigation measures from Section XVII, "Earlier Analyses," may be cross-referenced).
- 5) Earlier analyses may be used where, pursuant to the tiering, program EIR, or other CEQA process, an effect has been adequately analyzed in an earlier EIR or negative declaration Section 15063(c)(3)(D). In this case, a brief discussion should identify the following:
 - a) Earlier Analysis Used. Identify and state where they are available for review.
 - b) Impacts Adequately Addressed. Identify which effects from the above checklist were within the score of and adequately analyzed in an earlier document pursuant to applicable legal standards, and state whether such effects were addressed by mitigation measures based on the earlier analysis.
 - c) Mitigation Measures. For effects that are "Less than Significant with Mitigation Measures Incorporated", describe the mitigation measures that were incorporated or refined from the earlier document and the extent to which they address site-specific conditions for the project.
- 6) Lead agencies are encouraged to incorporate into the checklist references to information sources for potential impacts (e.g., general plans, zoning ordinances). Reference to a previously prepared or outside document should, where appropriate, include a reference to the page or pages where the statement is substantiated.
- 7) Supporting Information Sources: A source list should be attached, and other sources used or individuals contacted should be cited in the discussion.
- 8) This is only a suggested form, and lead agencies are free to use different formats.
- 9) The explanation of each issue should identify:
 - a) The significance criteria or threshold, if any, used to evaluate each question; and
 - b) The mitigation measure identified, if any, to reduce the impact to less than significant.

| Potentially Significant Impact | Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation | Less Than Significant Impact | No Impact |
|--------------------------------------|---|------------------------------------|--------------|
|--------------------------------------|---|------------------------------------|--------------|

I. AESTHETICS -- Would the project:

- | | | | | |
|--|--|--|--|----------|
| a) Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista? | | | | X |
| b) Substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway? | | | | X |
| c) Substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings? | | | | X |
| d) Create a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area? | | | | X |

II. AGRICULTURE RESOURCES -- In determining whether impacts to agricultural resources are significant environmental effects, lead agencies may refer to the California Agricultural Land Evaluation and Site Assessment Model prepared by the California Dept. of Conservation as an optional model to use in assessing impacts on agriculture and farmland.

Would the project:

- | | | | | |
|--|--|--|--|----------|
| a) Convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance (Farmland), as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency, to non-agricultural use? | | | | X |
| b) Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract? | | | | X |
| c) Involve other changes in the existing environment which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland to non-agricultural use? | | | | X |

III. AIR QUALITY -- Where available, the significance criteria established by the applicable air quality management or air pollution control district may be relied upon to make the following determinations.

Would the project:

- | | | | | |
|--|--|--|--|----------|
| a) Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable Air Quality Attainment Plan? | | | | X |
|--|--|--|--|----------|

| | Potentially Significant Impact | Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation | Less Than Significant Impact | No Impact |
|---|--------------------------------------|---|------------------------------------|--------------|
| b) Violate any air quality standard or contribute to an existing or projected air quality violation? | | | | X |
| c) Result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is non-attainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard (including releasing emissions which exceed quantitative thresholds for ozone precursors)? | | | | X |
| d) Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations? | | | | X |
| e) Create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people? | | | | X |

IV. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES -- Would the project:

| | | | | |
|--|--|--|--|----------|
| a) Have an adverse impact, either directly or through habitat modifications, any endangered, rare, or threatened species, as listed in Title 14 of the California Code of Regulations (sections 670.2 or 670.5) or in Title 50, Code of Federal Regulations (sections 17.11 or 17.12)? | | | | X |
| b) Have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Game or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service? | | | | X |
| c) Have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies, regulations or by the California Department of Fish and Game or US Fish and Wildlife Service? | | | | X |
| d) Have a substantial adverse effect on federally protected wetlands as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means? | | | | X |

| | Potentially Significant Impact | Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation | Less Than Significant Impact | No Impact |
|--|--------------------------------------|---|------------------------------------|--------------|
| e) Interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites? | | | | X |
| f) Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance? | | | | X |
| g) Conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Conservation Community Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan? | | | | X |
| V. CULTURAL RESOURCES -- Would the project: | | | | |
| a) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource? | | | | X |
| b) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a unique archaeological resources (i.e., an artifact, object, or site about which it can be clearly demonstrated that, without merely adding to the current body of knowledge, there is a high probability that it contains information needed to answer important scientific research questions, has a special and particular quality such as being the oldest or best available example of its type, or is directly associated with a scientifically recognized important prehistoric or historic event or person)? | | | | X |
| c) Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature? | | | | X |
| d) Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries? | | | | X |
| VI. GEOLOGY AND SOILS -- Would the project: | | | | |
| a) Expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving: | | | | |

| | Potentially Significant Impact | Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation | Less Than Significant Impact | No Impact |
|---|--------------------------------------|---|------------------------------------|--------------|
| 1) Rupture of a known earthquake fault, as delineated on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map issued by the State Geologist for the area or based on other substantial evidence of a known fault (refer to Division of Mines and Geology Special Publication 42)? | | | | X |
| 2) Strong seismic ground shaking? | | | | X |
| 3) Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction? | | | X | |
| 4) Landslides? | | | | X |
| b) Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil? | | | | X |
| c) Be located on strata or soil that is unstable, or that would become unstable as a result of the project, and potentially result in on- or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction or collapse? | | | X | |
| d) Be located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18 1 B of the Uniform Building Code, creating substantial risks to life or property? | | | | X |
| e) Have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative waste water disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of wastewater? | | | | X |

VII. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS --

Would the project:

- | | | |
|---|---|---|
| a) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials? | X | |
| b) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment? | | X |

| | Potentially Significant Impact | Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation | Less Than Significant Impact | No Impact |
|--|--------------------------------------|---|------------------------------------|--------------|
| c) Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school? | | X | | |
| d) Be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 and, as a result, would it create a significant hazard to the public or the environment? | | | | X |
| e) For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area? | | | | X |
| f) For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area? | | | | X |
| 9) Impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan? | | | | X |
| h) Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires, including where wildlands are adjacent to urbanized areas or where residences are intermixed with wildlands? | | | | X |

VIII. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY -- Would the project:

| | | | | |
|---|--|--|--|----------|
| a) Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements? | | | | X |
| b) Substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that there would be a net deficit in aquifer volume or a lowering of the local groundwater table level (e.g., the production rate of pre-existing nearby wells would drop to a level which would not support existing land uses or planned uses for which permits have been granted)? | | | | X |

| | Potentially Significant Impact | Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation | Less Than Significant Impact | No Impact |
|--|--------------------------------------|---|------------------------------------|--------------|
| c) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, in a manner which would result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site? | | | | X |
| d) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river or substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on- or off-site? | | | | X |
| e) Create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned storm water drainage systems? | | | | X |
| f) Place housing within a 100-year flood hazard area as mapped on a federal Flood Hazard Boundary or Flood Insurance Rate Map or other flood hazard delineation map? | | | | X |
| g) Place within a 100-year flood hazard area structures which would impede or redirect flood flows? | | | | X |
| h) Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving flooding, including flooding as a result of the failure of a levee or dam? | | | | X |
| i) Inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow? | | | | X |

IX. LAND USE AND PLANNING -- Would the project:

| | | | | |
|---|--|--|----------|----------|
| a) Physically divide an established community? | | | | X |
| b) Conflict with any applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation of an agency with jurisdiction over the project (including, but not limited to the general plan, specific plan, local coastal program, or zoning ordinance) adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect? | | | X | |
| c) Conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural communities conservation plan? | | | | X |

| | Potentially Significant Impact | Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation | Less Than Significant Impact | No Impact |
|--|--------------------------------------|---|------------------------------------|--------------|
|--|--------------------------------------|---|------------------------------------|--------------|

X. MINERAL RESOURCES -- Would the project:

- | | | | | |
|--|--|--|--|----------|
| a) Result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource classified MRZ-2 by the State Geologist that would be of value to the region and the residents of the state? | | | | X |
| b) Result in the loss of availability of a locally important mineral resource recovery site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan or other land use plan? | | | | X |

XI. NATIONAL POLLUTION DISCHARGE ELIMINATION SYSTEM

Yes **No**

Is the site currently developed?

X

Does the site currently discharge into the storm drain system?

X

Would the project:

- | | | | | |
|--|--|--|--|----------|
| a) Result in at least 5,000 square feet of impervious surface? | | | | X |
| b) Discharge pollutants into the storm drain or waterway? | | | | X |
| c) Does the proposal have the potential to violate The National Pollution Discharge Elimination System Permit? | | | | X |

| | Potentially Significant Impact | Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation | Less Than Significant Impact | No Impact |
|--|--------------------------------------|---|------------------------------------|--------------|
|--|--------------------------------------|---|------------------------------------|--------------|

XII. NOISE -- Would the project result in:

- | | | | | |
|---|--|--|----------|--|
| a) Exposure of persons to or generation of noise levels in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies? | | | X | |
|---|--|--|----------|--|

| | Potentially Significant Impact | Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation | Less Than Significant Impact | No Impact |
|---|--------------------------------------|---|------------------------------------|--------------|
| b) Exposure of persons to or generation of excessive ground borne vibration or ground borne noise levels? | | | X | |
| c) A substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project? | | | | X |
| d) A substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project? | | | | X |
| e) For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels? | | | | X |
| f) For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels? | | | | X |

XII. POPULATION AND HOUSING -- Would the project:

| | | | | |
|---|--|--|--|----------|
| a) Induce substantial population growth in an area, either directly (for example, by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (for example, through extension of roads or other infrastructure)? | | | | X |
| b) Displace substantial numbers of existing housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere? | | | | X |
| c) Displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere? | | | | X |

XIII. PUBLIC SERVICES -- Would the project result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities, need for new or physically altered governmental facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times or other performance objectives for any of the public services:

| | Potentially Significant Impact | Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation | Less Than Significant Impact | No Impact |
|-----------------------------|--------------------------------------|---|------------------------------------|--------------|
| a) Fire protection? | | | | X |
| b) Police protection? | | | | X |
| c) Schools? | | | | X |
| d) Parks? | | | | X |
| e) Other public facilities? | | | | X |

XIV. RECREATION -- Would the project:

| | | | | |
|--|--|--|--|----------|
| a) Increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated? | | | | X |
| b) Include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities which might have an adverse physical effect on the environment? | | | | X |

XV. TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC -- Would the project:

| | | | | |
|--|--|----------|--|----------|
| a) Cause an increase in traffic which is substantial in relation to the existing traffic load and capacity of the street system (i.e., result in a substantial increase in either the number of vehicle trips, the volume or capacity ratio on roads, or congestion at intersections)? | | | | X |
| b) Exceed, either individually or cumulatively, a level of service standard established by the county congestion management agency for designated roads or highways? | | | | X |
| c) Result in a change in air traffic patterns, including either an increase in traffic levels or a change in location that results in substantial safety risks? | | | | X |
| d) Substantially increase hazards to a design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)? | | | | X |
| e) Result in inadequate emergency access? | | | | X |
| f) Result in inadequate parking capacity? | | X | | |

| | Potentially Significant Impact | Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation | Less Than Significant Impact | No impact |
|--|--------------------------------------|---|------------------------------------|--------------|
| 9) Conflict with adopted policies supporting alternative transportation (e.g., bus turnouts, bicycle racks)? | | | | X |

XVII. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS --

| | | | | |
|--|--|--|--|----------|
| a) Would the project Exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board? | | | | X |
| b) Would the project require or result in the construction of new water or wastewater treatment facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects? | | | | X |
| c) Would the project require or result in the construction of new storm water drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects? | | | | X |
| d) Are sufficient water supplies available to serve the project from existing entitlement and resources, or are new or expanded entitlement needed? | | | | X |
| e) Has the wastewater treatment provider which serves or may serve the project determined that it has adequate capacity to serve the projects projected demand in addition to the provider's existing commitments? | | | | X |
| f) Is the project served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project's solid waste disposal needs? | | | | X |
| g) Comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste? | | | | X |

| | | | |
|--------------------------------------|---|------------------------------------|--------------|
| Potentially Significant Impact | Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporation | Less Than Significant Impact | No impact |
|--------------------------------------|---|------------------------------------|--------------|

XVIII. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE --

- | | |
|--|----------|
| a) Does the project have the potential to degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory? | X |
| b) Does the project have impacts that are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable? ("Cumulatively considerable" means that the incremental effects of a project are considerable when viewed in connection with the effects of past projects, the effects of other current projects, and the effects of probable future projects)? | X |
| c) Does the project have environmental effects which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly? | X |

DISCUSSION OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS

I. AESTHETICS

a.) Would the project have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista?

No Impact:

The proposed project is located within an existing park setting, and the proposed addition to the existing swimming pool building is to be constructed along the western wall of the existing swimming pool building. Because of the location of this addition (see plans), the project will not interfere with views into or through the existing park. The proposed project will result in more building coverage on the site than that which presently exists, but this increase in coverage is not anticipated to have a substantial adverse impact on the project site or the immediate surrounding area.

b.) Would the project substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway?

No Impact:

The proposed project is located within a community park in a highly urbanized area. While there are scenic resources within the park site, the proposed project area is not part of those scenic resources. Moreover, the project site is not located on or near a designated State Scenic Highway or Historic Buildings.

c.) Would the project substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings?

No Impact:

Since the project area is largely visible from the public right-of-way, but not visible from the interior of the park itself, there is no visual impact to park users. The project is not anticipated to substantially degrade the existing visual character of the site or surroundings.

d.) Would the project create a new source of substantial light or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area?

No Impact:

The proposed project is anticipated to introduce some additional light sources into project area. However, there is already existing security lighting within the project site and street lighting along the public rights-of-way. The exterior light sources will be directed down, where feasible. The incremental change in lighting associated with this project is not expected to have any adverse impact upon nighttime lighting levels in this area.

II. AGRICULTURE RESOURCES

The project site is not located within an agricultural zone, and there are no agricultural zones within the vicinity of the project. The proposed project is located within a section of the city that has been developed for over 75 years. Development of the proposed project will have no effect on agricultural resources within the City of Long Beach or any other neighboring city or county.

III. AIR QUALITY

The South Coast Air Basin is subject to possibly some of the worst air pollution in the country, attributable mainly to its topography, climate, meteorological conditions, a large population base, and highly dispersed urban land use patterns.

Air quality conditions are primarily affected by the rate and location of pollutant emissions and by climatic conditions that influence the movement and dispersion of pollutants. Atmospheric conditions such as wind speed, wind direction, and air temperature gradients, along with local and regional topography, provide the links between air pollutant emissions and air quality.

The South Coast Air Basin generally has a limited capability to disperse air contaminants because of its low wind speeds and persistent temperature inversions. In the Long Beach area, predominantly daily winds consist of morning onshore airflow from the southwest at a mean speed of 7.3 miles per hour and afternoon and evening offshore airflow from the northwest at 0.2 to 4.7 miles per hour with little variability between seasons. Summer wind speeds average slightly higher than winter wind speeds. The prevailing winds carry air contaminants

northward and then eastward over Whittier, Covina, Pomona and Riverside.

The majority of pollutants normally found in the Los Angeles County atmosphere originate from automobile exhausts as unburned hydrocarbons, carbon monoxide, oxides of nitrogen and other materials. Of the five major pollutant types (carbon monoxide, nitrogen oxides, reactive organic gases, sulfur oxides, and particulates), only sulfur oxide emissions are dominated by sources other than automobile exhaust.

a.) Would the project conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable Air Quality Attainment Plan?

No Impact:

The Southern California Association of Governments has determined that if a project is consistent with the growth forecasts for the sub region in which it is located, it is consistent with the Air Quality Management Plan (AQMP) and regional emissions are mitigated by the control strategy specified in the AQMP. The project is consistent with the goals of the City of Long Beach Air Quality Element that calls for achieving air quality improvements in a manner that continues economic growth.

b.) Would the project violate any air quality standard or contribute to an existing or projected air quality violation?

No Impact:

The California Air Resources Board regulates mobile emissions and oversees the activities of county Air Pollution Control Districts (APCDs) and regional Air Quality Management Districts (AQMDs) in California. The South Coast Air Quality Management District (SCAQMD) is the regional agency empowered to regulate stationary and mobile sources in the South Coast Air Basin.

To determine whether a project generates sufficient quantities of air pollution to be considered significant, the SCAQMD adopted maximum thresholds of significance for mobile and stationary producers in the South Coast Air Basin (SCAB), (i.e., cars, trucks, buses and energy consumption). SCAQMD Conformity Procedures (Section 6.3 of the CEQA Air Quality Handbook, April 1993) states that all government actions that generate emission greater than the following thresholds are considered regionally significant (see Table 1).

Table 1. SCAQMD Significance Thresholds

| Pollutant | Construction Thresholds (lbs/day) | Operational Thresholds (lbs/day) |
|------------------|--|---|
| ROC | 75 | 55 |
| NO _x | 100 | 55 |
| CO | 550 | 550 |
| PM ₁₀ | 150 | 150 |
| SO _x | 150 | 150 |

Construction emissions are estimated to be below threshold levels. The estimated emissions produced during the duration of the construction are based on 3,854 sq. ft. over a period of 6 months and represent a worst-case scenario. The source of these estimates is based on URBEMIS 2002 Air Emissions for Land Development Software calculations. The table below indicates the results.

| | ROC | NO_x | CO | PM₁₀ |
|--------------------|------------|-----------------------|-----------|------------------------|
| Project Emissions | 4.4 | 31.13 | 30.62 | 1.4 |
| AQMD Thresholds | 75 | 100 | 550 | 150 |
| Exceeds Thresholds | No | No | No | No |

Estimated automobile emissions from the project are listed in the table below. The source of these estimates are based on CEQA Air Quality Handbook, revised 1993, Table 9-7 Screening Table for Estimating Mobile Source Operation Emissions. The primary source of operational emissions is vehicle trips of which this project is unlikely to produce significant new vehicle trips. Please also see XV (a) and (b) supra for discussion. Based on these estimates the proposed project does not exceed threshold levels for mobile emissions. The table below indicates the results.

| | ROC | NO_x | CO | PM₁₀ |
|--------------------|------------|-----------------------|-----------|------------------------|
| Project Emissions | 0.04 | 0.04 | 0.55 | 0.04 |
| AQMD Thresholds | 55 | 55 | 550 | 150 |
| Exceeds Thresholds | No | No | No | No |

c.) Would the project result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is

non-attainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard (including releasing emissions which exceed quantitative thresholds for ozone precursors)?

No Impact:

Please see III (b) and (a) supra for discussion.

d.) Would the project expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?

No Impact:

The project site is located within a community park and is not in proximity to any residential areas or areas of sensitive receptors. Furthermore, the proposal is not anticipated to produce significant levels of any emission that could affect sensitive receptors.

e.) Create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people?

No Impacts:

Because of the type and nature of the project, the construction and operation of this project is not anticipated to create any objectionable odors that would affect residents or residential developments.

IV. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES

Less Than Significant Impact With Mitigation Measure Incorporated

The project site is located within a community park, in a highly urbanized setting. The park does provide some forage and habitat for many bird species. There is relatively little vegetation within the defined project area, consisting mostly of common horticultural species.

While the project site is in relatively close proximity to park, the proposed project is not anticipated to interfere with any of the animal species that use or inhabit the park. However, any mature trees being removed from the site to facilitate construction of the proposed project, should be replaced, at MLK Park, at a 2 for 1 ration.

The proposed site is not located in a protected wetlands area. Also, the development of the site is not anticipated to interfere with the migratory movement of any wildlife species.

- 1.) Any mature trees being removed from the site to facilitate construction of the proposed project, should be replaced, at MLK Park, at a 2 for 1 ration.

V. CULTURAL RESOURCES

There is some evidence to indicate that primitive people inhabited portions of the city as early as 5,000 to 2,000 B.C. Much of the remains and artifacts of these ancient people have been destroyed as the city has been developed. Of the archaeological sites remaining, many of them seem to be located in the southeast sector of the city.

The proposed construction may require some excavation; however, due to previous development on the site, the required excavation is not anticipated to impact any unknown latent artifacts. In addition, the site is located outside the area of the city expected to have the higher probability of latent artifacts.

VI. GEOLOGY AND SOILS

No faults are known to pass beneath the site, and the area is not in the Alquist-Priolo Special Studies Zone. The most significant fault system in the vicinity is the Newport-Inglewood fault zone. Other potentially active faults in the area are the Richfield Fault, the Marine Stadium Fault, the Palos Verdes Fault and the Los Alamitos Fault.

The project site is located in an area for a potential liquefaction based on Seismic Safety Element of the City's General Plan. The relative close proximity of the Newport-Inglewood Fault could create substantial ground shaking at the proposed site if a seismic event occurred along the fault, but there are numerous variables that determine the level of damage to a given location. It is not possible to precisely determine the level of damage that may occur on the site during a seismic event. However, the new construction must conform to all current state and local building codes, which is the standard for acceptable risk.

Would the project:

- a) **Expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving:**
 - i) **Rupture of a known earthquake fault, as delineated on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map issued by the State Geologist for the area or based on other**

substantial evidence of a known fault? Refer to Division of Mines and Geology Special Publication 42.

No Impact:

The proposed project is not located within a delineated Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zone.

ii) Strong seismic ground shaking?

No Impact:

See discussion above.

iii) Seismic-related ground failure, including Liquefaction?

Less than Significant Impact:

The project site is located within a designated potential liquefaction zone and all new construction shall conform to all applicable building codes for construction within a potential liquefaction zone, which is the standard for acceptable risk.

iv) Landslides?

No Impact:

The project site is situated on relatively flat, level ground, and is not susceptible to landslides.

b) Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?

No Impact:

Currently, the project site is paved and is not susceptible to soil erosion in its current state. Since the proposed project will result in expanded paved areas, with the exception of project landscaping, the project is not anticipated to cause any soil erosion or loss of topsoil.

c) Be located on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable, or that would become unstable as a result of the project, and potentially result in on- or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction or collapse?

Less than Significant Impact:

While the project is located within a designated potential liquefaction zone, the geology of the site is not anticipated to be adversely affected as a result of the project. The Uniform Building Code is designed to mitigate building failure and loss of life from major seismic events and all new construction will be required to conform to all current and applicable building and construction codes.

Please see VI (a) (iii) for further discussion.

- d) Be located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18-1-B of the Uniform Building Code (1994), creating substantial risks to life or property?**

No Impact:

The project is not located in an area of expansive soils as defined in Table 18-1 B of the Uniform Building Code.

- e) Have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of septic tanks or alternative wastewater disposal systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of wastewater?**

No Impact:

The project will connect to the municipal sanitary sewer system.

VII. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS

- a.) Would the project create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, use, or disposal of hazardous materials?**

Less Than Significant Impact With Mitigation Incorporation:

The proposed project will include an expansion of the existing pool facilities at Martin Luther King Jr. Park. Hazardous chemicals (mostly chlorine) will be used and stored on-site at the pool facility. These hazardous chemicals may potentially pose a hazard to the public or the environment if certain precautions are not taken. Although the risk of hazard is very low, the following mitigation measures are proposed:

- 1.) The applicant shall abide by all Federal, State, and Local requirements regarding storage and use of all hazardous and potentially hazardous chemicals to be stored on the project site.

It is anticipated that the project will have a less than significant impact with respect to this resource category with mitigation incorporation.

- b.) Would the project create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment?**

Less Than Significant Impact:

Please see VII (a) supra for discussion.

- c.) Would the project emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school?**

Less Than Significant Impact With Mitigation Incorporation:

While some hazardous materials (chlorine and other pool related chemicals) will be used and stored on the premises, there is a relatively small chance that these chemicals would pose a substantial risk of being released into the environment. However, because of the project site's proximity to an existing school, the following mitigation measures are proposed:

- 2.) The applicant shall abide by all Federal, State, and Local requirements regarding storage and use of all hazardous and potentially hazardous chemicals to be stored on the project site.
- 3.) Any staff responsible for the on-site handling and storage of and hazardous or potentially hazardous materials shall be trained in the proper emergency response(s) and have available to them contact information for Long Beach City College administration in the event of an accident or emergency that would necessitate a quick response and/or contacting school officials.

It is anticipated that the proposed project will have a less than significant impact with respect to this resource category with mitigation incorporation.

Also see VII (a) supra for discussion.

- d.) Would the project be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 and, as a result, would it create a significant hazard to the public or the environment?**

No Impact:

The Hazardous Waste and Substances Sites (Cortese) List is a planning document used by the State, local agencies and developers to comply with the California Environmental Quality Act requirements in providing information about the location of hazardous materials release sites. Cortese List does not list the proposed development site as contaminated with hazardous materials.

- e.) For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?**

No Impact:

The proposed project site is not located within the airport land use plan.

- f.) For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?**

No Impact:

The project site is not located in the vicinity of a private airstrip.

Please see VII (e) supra for discussion.

- g.) Would the project impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan?**

No Impact:

The proposed project will not impair implementation of or physically interfere with an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan.

- h.) Would the project expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wild land fires, including where wild lands are adjacent to urbanized areas or where residences are intermixed with wild lands?**

No Impact:

The proposed site is within an existing park setting in a highly urbanized area, and is not anticipated to expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wild land fires.

VIII. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY

The Flood Insurance Administration has prepared a new Flood Hazard Map designating potential flood zones, (Based on the projected inundation limits for breach of the Hansen Dam and that of the Whittier Narrows Dam, as well as the 100-year flood as delineated by the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers) which was adopted in July 1998.

The site is not located within a FEMA designated flood zone (X zone designation). All storm and sanitary sewer drains are currently in place and the site is fully developed.

- a) Would the project violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements?**

No Impact:

Development of the proposed project will not violate wastewater discharge standards. The proposed project would comply with all state and federal requirements pertaining to waste discharge and preservation of water quality.

- b) Would the project substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that there would be a net deficit in aquifer volume or a lowering of the local groundwater table level (e.g., the production rate of pre-existing nearby wells would drop to a level which would not support existing land uses or planned uses for which permits have been granted)?**

No Impact

The project construction would not be expected to involve any grading that would affect the groundwater table in the area. Project operations would not be expected to adversely affect groundwater supplies.

- c) Would the project substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, in a manner which would result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site?**

No Impact:

The project sites are within an urbanized area with storm water drainage infrastructure in place. Runoff from the site is not expected to exceed the capacity of the local storm drain system.

- d) Would the project substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river or substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on- or off-site?**

No Impact:

Please see VIII (b) supra for discussion.

- e) Would the project create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned storm water drainage systems?**

No Impact:

Please see VIII (b) supra for discussion.

- f) Would the project place housing within a 100-year flood hazard area as mapped on a federal Flood Hazard Boundary or Flood Insurance Rate Map or other flood hazard delineation map?**

No Impact:

The proposed project will not place housing within a 100-year flood hazard area.

- g) Would the project place within a 100-year flood hazard area structures which would impede or redirect flood flows?**

No Impact:

The proposed site is not within a 100-year flood hazard area.

- h) Would the project expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving flooding, including flooding as a result of the failure of a levee or dam?**

No Impact:

The proposed project is not within a zone influenced by the inundation of seiche, tsunami, or mudflow as shown in the Long Beach Seismic Element.

IX. LAND USE AND PLANNING

- a) Would the project physically divide an established community?**

No Impact:

The proposed development is located within an existing community park. The development of the proposed project site will not divide the surrounding established community.

- b) Would the project conflict with any applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation of an agency with jurisdiction over the project (including, but not limited to the general plan, specific plan, local coastal program, or zoning ordinance) adopted for the purpose of avoiding or mitigating an environmental effect?**

Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporation:

While the proposed project is consistent with the City of Long Beach's General Plan Land Use District, Open Space/Parks (LUD-11), and the City's Zoning Ordinance, the project is inconsistent with the City's Open Space and Recreation Element of the General Plan, which limits the ratio of amount of building coverage to open space in "community parks" to no more than ten percent (10%) of the total park area. The overall project site area is approximately 387,684 square feet, of which 48,143 square feet, or twelve percent (12%), is existing building area, and the proposed addition to the pool building is approximately 3,854 square feet, which will bring the total building area within the park to

51,997 square feet, or thirteen percent (13%). A Standards Variance from Section 21.35.220 of the Long Beach Municipal Code will be required. Section 21.35.205 of the Long Beach Municipal Code requires that any "conversion of parkland" to non-park uses, must be replaced on amenity-for-amenity basis on at least a two to one (2:1) ratio. However, because the proposed project is consistent with Section 21.35 of the Long Beach Municipal Code, as an accessory use to the pool facility, this action is not a "conversion of parkland" and will not require a (2:1) replacement.

In addition, the proposed project in its current design will require setback variances from the parking lot side facing 19th Street (2'0" instead of the required 10'0") and from the parking lot side facing Lemon Avenue (3'0" instead of 10'0"). A side yard setback variance will also be required along 19th Street (0'8" instead of the required 10'0") as well as a standards variance for a curb cut location (35'0" from the intersection of 19th Street and Lemon Avenue, instead of the required 90'0"). Because of the necessity of these variances based on the submitted plans, the following mitigation measures are proposed:

- 4.) Project Applicant shall apply for and be granted a Standards Variance for relief from development standards pertaining to lot coverage within a community park. (13% lot coverage ratio instead of the maximum 10%)
- 5.) Project Applicant shall apply for and be granted a Standards Variance for relief from development standards pertaining to parking lot setbacks from 19th Street (2'0" instead of 10'0') and Lemon Avenue (3'0" instead of 10'0").
- 6.) Project Applicant shall apply for and be granted a Standards Variance for relief from development standards pertaining to curb cut location from the intersection of Lemon Ave. and 19th Street (35'0' instead of the required 90'0").

It is anticipated that the proposed project will have a less than significant impact with respect to this resource category with mitigation incorporation.

c) Would the project conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural communities conservation plan?

No Impact:

There is no specific conservation plan adopted or proposed for the project site.

X. MINERAL RESOURCES

The primary mineral resource within the City of Long Beach has been oil. From the beginning of this century, oil extraction operations within the city have diminished as this resource has become depleted due to extraction operations. Today oil extraction continues but on a much reduced scale in comparison to that which occurred in the past. The proposed site does not contain any oil extraction operations and development is not anticipated to have a negative impact on this resource.

No adverse impacts are anticipated to mineral resources.

XI. National Pollution Discharge Elimination System (NPDES)

The scale of the project will not trigger conformance with the National Pollution Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) regulation of the Clean Water Act of 1972 as amended. The Act requires applicable projects to obtain an NPDES permit and comply with development standards. The intent of the Act is to reduce, to the maximum extent practical, water borne pollutants from entering storm water drainage systems and ultimately, receiving water bodies, i.e., oceans, lakes, and streams. The Los Angeles County Regional Water Quality Control Board (LACRWQCB) is the lead agency for promulgating these regulations. The City of Long Beach sought and received a separate NPDES permit in June 1999, with certain specified requirements, from the LACRWQCB to administer the NPDES regulations within its jurisdiction. The City of Long Beach Department of Planning and Building is charged with processing and enforcing NPDES regulations.

XII. NOISE

Noise is defined as unwanted sound that disturbs human activity. Environmental noise levels typically fluctuate over time, and different types of noise descriptors are used to account for this variability. Measuring noise levels involves intensity, frequency, and duration, as well as time of occurrence.

Some land uses are considered more sensitive to ambient noise levels than other uses, due to the amount of noise exposure and the types of activities involved. Residences, motels, hotels, schools, libraries, churches, nursing homes, auditoriums, parks and outdoor recreation

areas are generally more sensitive to noise than are commercial and industrial land uses.

The City of Long Beach uses the State Noise/Land Use Compatibility Standards, which suggests a desirable exterior noise exposure at 65 dBA CNEL for sensitive land uses such as residences. Less sensitive commercial and industrial uses may be compatible with ambient noise levels up to 70 dBA. The City of Long Beach has an adopted Noise Ordinance that sets exterior and interior noise standards.

The proposed project is not anticipated to exceed any noise standards as defined by the City of Long Beach Noise Ordinance.

a) Would the project exposure of persons to or generation of noise levels in excess of standards established in the local general plan or noise ordinance or applicable standards of other agencies?

Less Than Significant Impact:

Development of the proposed project is not expected to create noise levels in excess of those already existing as well as those established by the Long Beach City Ordinance. During the period of construction, the development may cause temporary increases within the ambient noise levels but it is not expected to exceed established standards. Project construction must conform to Noise Ordinance. As stated in §8.80.202, "no person shall operate or permit the operation of any tools or equipment used for construction, alternation, repair, remodeling, drilling, demolition or any other related building activity which would produce loud or unusual noise which annoys or disturbs a reasonable person of normal sensitivity between the hours of seven p.m. and seven a.m.

b) Would the project exposure of persons to or generation of excessive ground borne vibration or ground borne noise levels?

Less than Significant Impact:

During the construction phase of the proposed project, park visitors in the immediate vicinity may experience some ground borne vibration during grading or ground preparation. This effect will be short-lived, limited to the preparation of land and any demolition required.

- c) Would the project create a substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?**

No Impact:

Ambient noise levels in the general vicinity of the proposed project sight are not anticipated to increase as a result of the proposed project. The project site is currently being used as a community park and swimming pool facility, and this use will not change as a result of the project. The addition to the existing pool facility is not expected to increase the amount of persons using the pool, the primary goal is to provide those already using the pool more adequate facilities.

- d) Would the project create a substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project?**

No Impact:

Development of the proposed project is not expected to create a temporary increase in the ambient noise level. Once the development phase of the project is complete the noise levels created by the proposed project should be consistent and non-disruptive, similar to noise levels that existed before project construction.

- e) For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?**

No Impact:

The proposed development is not located within the airport land use plan.

- f) For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area excessive noise levels?**

No Impact:

See discussion XI (e) supra.

XIII. POPULATION AND HOUSING

The City of Long Beach is the second largest city in Los Angeles County and the fifth largest in California. According to the 2000 Census, Long Beach has a population of 461,522, which presents a 7.5 percent increase from the 1990 Census.

Since the project will not result in the demolition or construction of housing, nor will it adversely impact any existing housing, no significant adverse impacts are anticipated to population and housing.

XIV. PUBLIC SERVICES

Fire protection is provided by the Long Beach Fire Department. The Department has 23 in-city stations. The Department is divided into Fire Prevention, Fire Suppression, Bureau of Instruction, and the Bureau of Technical Services. The Fire Department is accountable for medical, paramedic, and other first aid rescue calls from the community. The proposed project is not anticipated to have any impact on Fire Services.

The Long Beach Police Department serves the project site. The Department is divided into Patrol, Traffic, Detective, Juvenile, Vice, Community, Jail, Records, and Administration Sections. The City has four Patrol Divisions: East, West, North and South. The proposed project is not anticipated to have any impact on Police Services.

The City of Long Beach is primarily served by the Long Beach Unified School District (LBUSD), which also serves the Cities of Signal Hill, and most of Lakewood. The District has been operating at or over capacity in recent years. Since this project has no housing component, there is no impact anticipated to public schools.

XV. RECREATION

The City's Department of Parks, Recreation and Marine provide public recreation and open space. Since the proposed project is to improve an existing park pool facility at Martin Luther King Jr. Park, the project is not anticipated to have an adverse impact upon park and recreational facilities. Rather, it is anticipated that the proposed project will have a

beneficial impact on those who use the pool and other facilities at Martin Luther King Jr. Park.

No adverse impacts are anticipated with respect to parks and recreational facilities.

XVI. TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC

Since 1980, Long Beach has experienced significant growth. Continued growth is expected into the next decade. Inevitably, growth will generate additional demand for travel. Without proper planning and necessary transportation improvements, this increase in travel demand, if unmanaged, could result in gridlock on freeways and streets, and jeopardize the tranquility of residential neighborhoods.

- a. Would the project cause an increase in traffic which is substantial in relation to the existing traffic load and capacity of the street system (i.e., result in a substantial increase in either the number of vehicle trips, the volume or capacity ratio on roads, or congestion at intersections)?**

No Impact:

While the proposed project will result in an expanded pool facility, the project is not anticipated to create an increase in automobile traffic that would adversely affect the surrounding street system. The primary purpose of the project is to improve existing facilities and to accommodate existing park patrons, not to expand facilities to create an increase in park usage.

- b.) Would the project exceed, either individually or cumulatively, a level of service standard established by the county congestion management agency for designated roads or highways?**

No Impact:

See discussion XVI (a) supra.

- c.) Would the project result in a change in air traffic patterns, including either an increase in traffic levels or a change in location that results in substantial safety risks?**

No Impact:

The project will not result in a change in air traffic patterns or increase in traffic levels. The project is not located within or near an airport zone and will not result in any direct or indirect impacts to an airport zone.

d.) Would the project substantially increase hazards to a design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?

No Impact:

The proposed project is not anticipated to have any adverse impact on building design or roadway features, nor will it result in any incompatible uses with the existing buildings and roadways.

e.) Would the project result in inadequate emergency access?

No Impact:

The design and layout of the project is not anticipated to have an adverse impact on emergency access to the park or buildings within the park.

f.) Would the project result in inadequate parking capacity?

Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporation:

The park provides 52 standard parking spaces, as well as 6 handicapped accessible spaces. The amount of parking presently provided on-site is below that which would be required by the current Zoning Ordinance. The proposed project will add approximately 3,854 square feet of building area to that which is currently existing. However, the collection of facilities that will be added, are currently being used at other locations on the site (i.e., restrooms, showers, and office space for the lifeguards), and because the proposed project is accessory to the pool facility, the project applicant is requesting a Standards Variance from parking requirements.

Less Than Significant with Mitigation Measure Incorporated:

- 7.) The project applicant shall either: a.) Redesign project plans to include additional parking per current Zoning regulations, or b.) Apply for and be granted a Standards Variance for relief from parking requirements.

XVII. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS

Since all utilities and service systems are currently in place and the proposed project will require only marginal, if any, expansion of utility and service systems, no significant adverse impacts are anticipated to occur during the construction and operation of the proposed project.

a.) Would the project exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board?

No Impact:

The proposed project is not anticipated to generate any significant amount of wastewater.

b.) Would the project require or result in the construction of new water or wastewater treatment facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?

No Impact:

See XVII (a) supra for discussion.

c.) Would the project require or result in the construction of new storm water drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?

No Impact:

While the project may be required to construct new storm water drainage infrastructure to tie into the existing storm water drainage system, no new facilities or expansion of existing facilities will be required as a result of the project.

d.) Would the project have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project from existing entitlements and resources, or are new or expanded entitlements needed?

No Impact:

The project has been reviewed by the Long Beach Water Department, and it has been concluded that available water supplies are sufficient to serve the project.

- e.) Would the project result in a determination by the wastewater treatment provider which serves or may serve the project that it has adequate capacity to serve the project's projected demand in addition to the provider's existing commitments?**

No Impact:

See discussion XIV (a) above.

- f.) Would the project be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project's solid waste disposal needs?**

No Impact:

Solid waste generated in the City of Long Beach is collected by the City's Integrated Resource Bureau – Refuse Collection Division, or by a private waste-removal company licensed by the City. It is the policy of the City to support a hierarchy of waste management preferences that give priority to source reduction, reuse of materials, and recycling in order to minimize the amount of waste to be managed. Refuse that is collected by the City is taken to the Southeast Resource Recoveries Facility (SERRF), a publicly owned solid waste management facility that employs 'mass burn' technology. Private waste removal companies either use the SERRF, or a refuse transfer station. The project is not anticipated to have a significant adverse impact on area landfills or transfer stations.

- g.) Would the project comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste?**

No Impact:

The proposed project will be required to comply with any and all applicable federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste.

XVII. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE

- a) **Does the project have the potential to degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory?**

No Impact:

The proposed project is within a well-established park setting; based on the size and scope of the project, there is no anticipated negative impact to any fish or wildlife habitat or species.

- b) **Does the project have impacts that are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable? (“Cumulatively considerable” means that the incremental effects of a project are considerable when viewed in connection with the effects of past projects, the effects of other current projects, and the effects of probable future projects)?**

No Impact:

The proposed project will not have a cumulative considerable effect on the environment.

- c) **Does the project have environmental effects which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?**

No Impact:

There are no adverse environmental effects to human life either directly or indirectly related to the proposed project.

MITIGATION MONITORING PLAN

1. Any mature trees being removed from the site to facilitate construction of the proposed project, should be replaced, at MLK Park, at a 2 for 1 ration

Timing: Prior to issuance of C of O.

Enforcement: Planning & Building

2. & 3. The applicant shall abide by all Federal, State, and Local requirements regarding storage and use of all hazardous and potentially hazardous chemicals to be stored on the project site.

Timing: Ongoing

Enforcement: Long Beach Fire Department; Long Beach Department of Health and Human Services

4. Any staff responsible for the on-site handling and storage of and hazardous or potentially hazardous materials shall be trained in the proper emergency response(s) and have available to them contact information for Long Beach City College administration in the event of an accident or emergency that would necessitate a quick response and/or contacting school officials.

Timing: Ongoing

Enforcement: Long Beach Department of Parks, Recreation, and Marine;
Long Beach Fire Department

5. Project Applicant shall apply for and be granted a variance for relief from development standards pertaining to lot coverage within a community park. (13% lot coverage ratio instead of the maximum 10%)

Timing: Prior to application for building permits

Enforcement: Department of Planning and Building

6. Project Applicant shall apply for and be granted a Standards Variance for relief from development standards pertaining to parking lot setbacks from 19th Street (2'0" instead of 10'0') and Lemon Avenue (3'0" instead of 10'0").

Timing: Prior to application for building permits

Enforcement: Department of Planning and Building

7. Project Applicant shall apply for and be granted a Standards Variance for relief from development standards pertaining to curb cut location from the intersection of Lemon Ave. and 19th Street (35'0' instead of the required 90'0").

Timing: Prior to application for building permits

Enforcement: Department of Planning and Building

8. The project applicant shall either: a.) Redesign project plans to include additional parking per current Zoning regulations, or b.) Apply for and be granted a Standards Variance for relief from parking requirements.

Timing: Prior to application for building permits

Enforcement: Department of Planning and Building

